# Framework

**Our interpretation of debate is that the Judge should evaluate competing policy options. We as debaters enter the debate round expecting to learn about policies and how they operate in the Real World. Simply Kritiking debate does not achieve progress rather hinders advocacy.**

**2) Prefer our interpretation:**

**First, Fairness:**

**A. Limits: There is an infinite number of Frameworks and advocacies. Allowing the negative team to do away with our 1AC and choose their own Framework hurts fairness and predicability. Having unpredictable debates means that the Affirmative will never be prepared for the rounds making for uneducational debates.**

**B. Ground: Negative frameworks destroy aff ground, mooting the aff advantages. Non-fiat frameworks destroy counterplan and disadvantage ground, which are key to negative flexibility which is necessary to overcome the advantages of being aff.**

**Second, Education:**

**A. The only way to resolve the constant ignoring of marginalized voices is to learn about the political process by which these decisions are made in the Real World. Only this way will citizen understanding and activism be sparked. Without any knowledge of the system, any changes will be minor, insignficant, and without influence.**

**B. Policy Debate under the Affirmative’s framework is the only way to evaluate Real World policies and impacts. Without examinging policies and their potential consequences, we will never learn how policies can affect the Real World.**

**C. Acting through the USFG is inevitable to avoid. It is a necessary organization of change. Without acting through the USFG, all advocacy efforts Fail.**

**3) And our Defense:**

**A. Fiat is most predictable: It’s the only way to be topical**

**Resolved means to express by formal vote—this is the only definition that’s in the context of the resolution**

**Webster’s Revised Unabridged Dictionary, 1998 (dictionary.com)**

**Resolved:**

5. To express, as an opinion or determination, by resolution and vote; to declare or decide by a formal vote; -- followed by a clause; as, the house resolved (or, it was resolved by the house) that no money should be apropriated (or, to appropriate no money).

**The U.S. government is 3 branches**

**Black’s Law Dictionary, 90** (6th Edition, p. 695)

In the United States, government consists of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches in addition to administrative agencies. In a broader sense, includes the federal government and all its agencies and bureaus, state and county governments, and city and township governments.

# Aff: Permutation

**Negative critiques of whiteness do not go far enough – The affirmative offers a strategy to move beyond oppositional debates.**

**Giroux, 1997 (H.A. “White Squall: Resistance and the Pedagogy of Whiteness,” *Cultural Studies*, 11(3) p 376-378)**

While it is imperative that a critical analysis of 'whiteness' address its historical legacy and existing complicity with racist exclusion and oppression, it is equally crucial that such work distinguish between 'whiteness' as a racial politics that is anti racist and those that are racist. 12 Where 'whiteness' has been dealt with in pedagogical terms the emphasis is almost exclusively on revealing 'whiteness' as an ideology of privilege mediated largely through the dynamics of racism.13 While such interventions are crucial in developing an anti racist pedagogy, they **do not go far enough**. I am con cerned about what it means pedagogically for those of us who engage in an anti racist pedagogy and politics to suggest to students that 'whiteness' can only be understood in terms of the common experience of white domination and racism. What subjectivities or points of identification become available to white students who can only imagine white experience as monolithic, self contained and deeply racist? What are the pedagogical and political stakes in rearticulating 'whiteness' in anti essentialist terms so that white youth can understand and struggle against the long legacy of white racism while using the particularities of 'their own culture as a resource for resistance, reflection, and empowerment?' (Hall, 1991: 57)14

There are too few attempts to develop a pedagogy of 'whiteness' that enables white students to move beyond positions of guilt or resentment. There is a curious absence in the work on 'whiteness' regarding how students might examine critically the construction of their own identities in order to rethink 'whiteness' as both a discourse of critique and possibility." Cultural critics need to connect 'whiteness' with a language of possibility that provides a space for white students to imagine how 'whiteness' as an ideology and social location can be progressively appropriated as part of a broader politics of social reform. 'Whiteness' needs to be theorized carefully in terms of its potential to provide students with a racial identity that can play a crucial role in refashioning an anti racist politics that informs broader, radical, democratic projects and coalitions.

Opening up a pedagogical space for addressing 'whiteness' more dialec tically may be possible by addressing the importance of 'whiteness' within a broader claim to cultural citizenship and a democratic, anti racist, pan ethnic movement while still being critical of forms of 'whiteness' structured in dominance and aligned with exploitative interests and oppressive social relations. By rearticulating 'whiteness' as more than a form of domination, white students can construct narratives of 'whiteness' that both challenge and, hopefully, provide a basis for transforming the dominant relationship between racial identity and citizenship, one informed by an oppositional politics. Such a political practice suggests new subject positions, alliances, commitments and forms of solidarity between white students and others engaged in a struggle over expanding the possibilities of democratic life, especially as it affirms both a politics of difference and a redistribution of power and material resources. George Vudice argues that, as part of a broader project for articulating 'whiteness' in oppositional terms, white youth must feel that they have a stake in racial politics that connects them to the struggles being waged by other groups. At the centre of such struggles is both the battle over citizenship redefined through the discourse of rights and the problem of resource distribution. He writes:

This is where identity politics segues into other issues, such as tax deficits, budget cuts, lack of educational opportunities, lack of jobs, immigration policies, international trade agreements, environmental blight, lack of health care insurance, and so on. These are the areas in which middle and working class whites historically have had an advantage over people of color. However, today that advantage has eroded in certain respects. (Vudice, 1995: 276)

Calling for a politics that engages the relationship between difference and the broader imperatives of public life, Vudice suggests that white youth can form alliances with other social and racial groups who recognize the need for solidarity in addressing issues of public culture that undermine the quality of democracy for all groups. As white youths struggle to find a cultural and political space from which to speak and act as transformative citizens, it is imperative that educators address what it means pedagogically and politically to help students rearticu late 'whiteness' as part of a demo cratic cultural politics. Central to such a task is the need to challenge the conventional left analysis of 'whiteness' as a space between guilt and denial, a space that offers limited forms of resistance and engagement. In order for teachers, students and others to come to terms with 'whiteness' existentially and intellectually, we need to take up the challenge in our classrooms and across a wide variety of public sites of confronting racism in all its com plexity and ideological and material formations. But most importantly, 'whiteness' must provide a diverse but critical space from which to wage a wider struggle against the myriad forces that undermine what it means to live in a society founded on the principles of freedom, racial justice and economic equality.16 Rewriting 'whiteness' within a discourse of resistance and possibility represents more than a challenge to dominant and progres sive notions of racial politics; it provides an important pedagogical project for educating cultural workers, teachers and students to engage and live with and through difference and diverse racial formations as a crossroads for articulating different cultural landscapes, identities, languages and his tories. By shifting the conceptual weight of whiteness away from racial hatred and the legacy of domination (less as an act of historical inquiry than as a social practice), it becomes possible to envisage and bear witness to whiteness in its diversity, temporary attachments and orders of belonging as a performative practice always open to negotiation which attempts to expand rather than restrict the possibilities of a multicultural and mul tiracial democracy.

# AFF: White Privilege focus bad

**The focus on white privilege is historically inaccurate and demobilizing. We should focus on racism instead of privilege.**

Naomi Zach, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Oregon, 1999, The Idea of White Privilege, “Whiteness”

Even in this most racist of cultures, there is no legal tradition that grants special rights to whites so much as there is a present social practice and past legal history of excluding nonwhites from the privileges assumed to belong to all citizens, in the second sense of the dictionary meaning of privilege. The idea of white privilege, then, must be an elliptical reference to the result of discrimination and exclusion of nonwhites. To call the result a privilege, which means a positive, specifically granted absolute advantage, rather than a relative one, clouds the issue of disparities between whites and nonwhites. It makes it seem as though the situation is both worse and better than it is: worse, as though at some time benefits for whites only were explicitly conferred upon by law; better, because the emphasis on white privilege ignores the discrimination against and exclusion of nonwhites that give raise to the racial disparity.

I do not think that the elliptical idea of white privilege can bear much weight philosophically. It certainly does not add anything to the idea of white race treason. To say that one is a white race traitor because one is against white race privilege is to say that in the sense of the civil rights movement-era American South one would betray the criminal intent of white people because compared to nonwhites who have been discriminated against and excluded, whites are better off. What is left out here is the claim that is was wrong and unfair for nonwhites to have been discriminated against and excluded. There may also be a tacit assumption lurking that whites are better off in some absolute sense when they are only better off relative to nonwhites. That is, if nonwhites were included in general privileges and not discriminated against, the net long-term effect might be more benefits for whites than they have now. Furthermore, the use of the term *white privilege* makes it seem as though white people have advantages and status that only white racist think they should have. To speak as though these privileges exist puts the comparative disadvantages of nonwhites “in the face” in the way that would seem (to me) to add further insult to injury. At this point it might be objected that some white people feel guilty about the fact that whites are so much better off than nonwhites.

**The negative is too aggressive in their descriptions of whiteness – Describing whiteness solely in terms of exploitation shuts down alliances and will not produce substantive challenges to racism**

Giroux, 1997 (H.A. “White Squall: Resistance and the Pedagogy of Whiteness,” *Cultural Studies*, 11(3) p 376-378)

While the recent scholarship on 'whiteness' has provided an important theoretical service for broadening the debate on race and racism, it is crucial for cultural workers and educators to recognize the limits of this work and begin to move beyond the current impasse of reducing 'whiteness' exclusively to forms of exploitation and domination. More specifically, much of the current literature fails to capture the complexity that marks 'whiteness' as a form of identity and cultural practice. The distinction between 'white ness' as a dominating ideology and white people who are positioned across multiple locations of privilege and subordination is often sacrificed to the assumption that 'whiteness' is simply 'the terrifying attempt to build an identity based on what one isn't and on whom one can hold back' (Roe diger, 1994: 13). Being white in this context appears by default to make one a racist.

While rightly unmasking 'whiteness' as a mark of ideology and racial privilege, the new scholarship fails to provide a nuanced, dialectical and layered account of 'whiteness' that would allow white youth and others to appropriate selective elements of white identity and culture as oppositional. This theoretical lacuna suggests that workers, educators and students face the task of rethinking the subversive possibility of 'whiteness'. Such a peda gogical and political challenge means, in part, re imagining 'whiteness' beyond both the fixed boundaries of identity politics, defined primarily through a discourse of separatism and white supremacy, or as an act of bad faith whites exhibiting what Eric [ott calls 'blackface's unconscious return' (quoted in Stowe, 1996: 76)11

# Aff Turn: Redeployment

**White supremacists will spark a race war, culminating in genocide.**

Southern Poverty Law Center, 2006 (“Extremism and the Military”,*Intelligence Report*, http://www.splcenter.org/intel/intelreport/article.jsp?aid=629)

But today the nightmare is back. Facing intense pressure to meet manpower goals in Iraq and Afghanistan, some commanders and recruiters have relaxed the standards that Weinberger and Perry sought to impose. As reported in a remarkable cover story by David Holthouse, many neo-Nazis have served or are serving in Iraq. Hundreds anonymously proclaim their ideology in racist online venues. At a single base, Fort Lewis, Wash., 320 soldiers are involved in extremist activity, according to a Defense Department investigator -- but just two of them have been discharged.

How serious is the problem? According to the Defense Department investigator and others who spoke to the Intelligence Report, there are "thousands" of soldiers in the Army alone who are involved in extremist or gang activity. If that sounds high, it's worth remembering that a 1996 study found that 0.52% of soldiers interviewed by military officials admitted to being members of a neo-Nazi or white supremacist group -- a far higher percentage than in the general population.

The ramifications are frightening. Timothy McVeigh, whose volcanic anger at the government partly stemmed from his service in the first Gulf War, went on to murder 168 people. Others, such as then-Green Beret Michael Tubbs of Florida, stole military weapons and explosives in plots to attack black and Jewish targets. And still others emerged from the armed forces to teach high-level military skills to fellow extremists, like White Patriot Party leaders did in the mid-1980s.

Hate groups and neo-Nazi ideologues routinely encourage their followers to join the military to hone their warrior skills. In the late 1990s, former Special Forces soldier and neo-Nazi leader Steven Barry urged skinheads to join the infantry "because the coming race war, and the ethnic cleansing to follow, will be very much an infantryman's war. It will be house-to-house, neighborhood-by-neighborhood, until your town or city is cleared and the alien races are ... hunted down."

# AFF: Racism inevtiable

**Racism will always be a problem no matter how it is combated.**

John **Brittian**, professor at University of Conneticut, School of Law, **2003**

[Is Racism Permanent? Poverty and Race Research Action Council, http://www.prrac.org/full\_text.php?text\_id=581&item\_id=5905&newsletter\_id=11&header=Race+%2F+Racism]

Black people will never gain full equality in this country. Even those Herculean efforts we hail as successful will produce no more than temporary `peaks of progress, short-lived victories that slide into irrelevance as racial patterns adapt in ways that maintain white dominance. This is a hard-to-accept fact that all history verifies. We must acknowledge it, not as a sign of submission, but as an act of ultimate defiance. Other civil rights advocates have expressed similar views. Robert Carter, a veteran civil rights lawyer and later federal district court judge, once said that the pioneer civil rights leaders thought that racial segregation was the disease. Once the civil rights movement eliminated the segregation, the society would achieve racial equality for the African American people. Instead, the leaders discovered that the segregation was only the symptom, and White racism was the disease. Still further, Kenneth B. Clark, a brilliant psychologist who conducted the studies concerning the adverse impact of segregated education on the learning abilities of Black children, recently lamented (see his contribution in Race In America: The Struggle for Equality, Herbert Hill and James E. Jones, Jr., eds., 1993): Reluctantly, I am forced to face the likely possibility that the United States will never rid itself of racism and reach true integration. I look back and shudder at how naive we all were in our belief in the steady progress racial minorities would make through programs of litigation and education, and while I very much hope for the emergence of a revived civil rights movement with innovative programs and educated leaders, I am forced to recognize that my life has, in fact, been a series of glorious defeats. I agree with the thoughts of these civil rights activists about the "permanence of racism" in America. The conditions of White racism remain the same, but some of the underlying assumptions may have changed. The traditional civil rights ideology was founded on the unstated assumption that human beings are equal in the eyes of God-the same; and that human nature unites us all in a common essences Together we will, in the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, reach the "promised land" of racial equality. The permanence of racism thesis attacks that "sameness" theory. Black feminists have stood up to say, "I am not the same as you and do not speak for me." This movement, dubbed anti-essentialism, suggests that no essence unites us as human beings. Rather, we are all individuals leading the attack with unique experiences that can neither be classed nor categorized. (For example, the Black lesbian faces a dilemma about which civil rights organizations to join. Should she join NOW, led by White women, or the NAACP led by Black men, or ACT-UP lead by gay and lesbian White people?) Anti-essentialists argue that unity must be built more by realistic connections, instead of relying on abstract and unreal notions of a common essence. Similarly, the permanence of racism thesis criticizes the idea that most White people in America will grant Black people, equal rights. In fact, according to Be African Americans advanced socially, politically and economically when the particular principle appealed to White Americans' self-interest. This means that people of color cannot rely on the majority of White people for a shared commonality of all human beings for equal treatment I recall a personal experience when I was a civil rights lawyer in Mississippi involving an old Black woman in Sunflower County with a fighting spirit like Fannie Lou Hamer. We came out of the federal court house one day after the judge praised the Black people for challenging some obvious vestige of racial segregation, but he denied their request for relief on some seemingly unpersuasive legal technicality. I sought to comfort her with condolences about the case that the people had lost. She taught me a lesson based on the knowledge that she acquired in life rather than by formal schooling. I never forgot. When she insisted that they had won, I tried to correct her on the legality of the decision, but she interrupted. She said they won because the Black people had the White people in town very scared about the potential impact of a favorable decision for them. True, everyone knew the White people were extremely concerned about a major change in the political relations with Black people. I thought to myself, how could this Black lady think that they had won? Then she said, "Lawyer Brittain, I just lives to upset these White folks and today we upset them." Hence, the permanence of racism theory means that this work will never end, only the battle fronts and tactics change..

# Turn: highlighting Racism Bad

**Highlighting the racial nature of poverty can result in racist policies.**

**SANFORD F. SCHRAM teaches social theory at Bryn Mawr 2003 (PUTTING A BLACK FACE ON WELFARE the Politics of Welfare Reform (Paperback) by Sanford F. Schram (Editor), Joe Soss (Editor), Richard C. Fording (Editor))**

Breaking with the conventional wisdom on racialized depictions of welfare has its own pitfalls. The risk here is the "Moynihan problem"; that is, looking into welfare along racial lines may he associated with Daniel P. Moynihan’s controversial work on the subject, the Negro Family (1965). This short (78 page) internal U.S. Department of Labor report, emphasizing the then well accepted theme of pathology among economically marginalized African Americans, was leaked to the press by Moynihan himself (Lemann '99', 171 72).

The report's distinctive claim was that welfare dependency among single parent African American families was starting to spiral out of control due to a breakdown in values in black communities. While the number of families on welfare historically had tracked the black male unemployment rate, in the early 196os, Moynihan suggested, the welfare participation rate for African Americans was becoming "unglued." The link between the black male unemployment rate and welfare caseloads was becoming weaker. Black poverty was turning into an autonomous problem disconnected from the status of the economy, indicating that the black family was becoming wrapped in a "tangle of pathology" (Katz 1989). To underscore its importance as a finding of social science, Moynihan would in time proudly call this phenomenon the "Moynihan Scissors" (Moynihan '985). His analysis has been criticized on methodological grounds for tying the unemployment of black males with the welfare caseload for all races, and subsequent research has shown the correlation to be unsubstantiated (O'Connor zoo, zo 6). The report reached bad conclusions on the basis of bad research.

Moynihan may have intended to highlight racial unfairness in the broader society (O'Connor 2001, 203 10), **but that is not how his effort was received**. Instead, the report was criticized for essentializing racial differences, reinforcing racist attitudes, and promoting the idea of a selfcreated "culture of poverty" in which low income African American families were mired making them personally responsible for their own plight. In particular, the report was condemned for stressing racial background as the key factor in producing poverty among African American families and neglecting its political and economic roots. Although Moynihan was rarely labeled a racist, his work was seen as "blaming the victim" (Ryan 1971).

The report deserved such interpretations**, in its effects if not intention**. Conservatives appropriated it to justify cutbacks in public assistance on the grounds that it promoted "welfare dependency" and undermined "personal responsibility" among African American families (O'Connor 2001). The Right campaigned on this theme for three decades, finally ending welfare as an entitlement in 1996. In spite of Moynihan's own pained resistance to that disentitlement, the seeds for the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 were sown in the Moynihan report (Katz zoo,).

# AFF: Race Neutrality good

**Turn: The negative is just defending the victim: we need to recognize that fighting racism directly won’t solve social ills: race-neutral policies are key to change the culture of poverty and maintain political support.**

**Sudhir Venkatesh 2009 (**[**http://www.slate.com/id/2213618/**](http://www.slate.com/id/2213618/) **Slate Magazine How To Understand the Culture of Poverty)**

More Than Just Race, which draws on Wilson's earlier research as well as more recent studies, is yet more proof of his willingness to ignore political and academic pieties and his will to make social science relevant to the public. Wilson wants to explain inner-city behavior—such as young black males' disdain for low-wage jobs, their use of violence, and their refusal to take responsibility for children—without pointing simplistically to discrimination or a deficit in values. Instead, he argues that many years of exposure to similar situations can create responses that look as if they express individual will or active preference when they are, in fact, adaptations or resigned responses to racial exclusion.

Consider a young man who works in the drug economy. Doing so doesn't mean he places little if any value on legitimate work. Employment opportunities are limited in the man's racially segregated neighborhood. There are few neighbors and friends who have social connections to employers, and most of the good jobs are far away. To complicate matters, many of his friends and neighbors are probably connected to the drug trade. Survival and peer pressure dictate that the man will seek out the dangerous, illegal jobs that are nearby, even while he may prefer a stable, mainstream job. Delinquent behavior? Certainly, but more than likely a comprehensible response to lack of opportunity.

One could apply the same logic to teenage pregnancy, another all too common feature of inner-city life. The political left and right both argue that the prospect of welfare payments can motivate young women to have children—conservatives point to delinquent values, while liberals deem this a response to lack of income. Apply Wilson's "socialization" lens, and learned behaviors take priority over economic need: Young women achieve both personal identity and social validation in their community by entering into motherhood. They join others whose lives are similarly defined by early parenting. The receipt of welfare helps them contribute to the household while placing them on a surer moral footing than those who fail to bring income into the home.

Wilson does more than argue for the rationality of such behaviors. The actions of both the young man and the teenage mother are "cultural," he suggests, because they follow from the individual's perceptions of how society works. These perceptions are learned over time, and they create powerful expectations that can lead individuals to act in ways that, to the outside world, suggest insolence, laziness, pathology, etc. In this way, Wilson's framework seeks to find individual agency in contexts of dire economic hardship.

Wilson describes this process succinctly: "Parents in segregated communities who have had experiences [with discrimination and disrespect] may transmit to children, through the process of socialization, a set of beliefs about what to expect from life and how one should respond to circumstances. … In the process children may acquire a disposition to interpret the way the world works that reflects a strong sense that other members of society disrespect them because they are black."

If you think you're at a disadvantage (however justified or unjustified that belief may be), you internalize your status, such that your low expectations become as durable an obstacle as the discrimination you might be facing. This is why people (of any race and social class) turn down assistance: The simple belief that help is futile can be a powerful deterrent to social change.

What Wilson argues may sound obvious and even a bit like Psychology 101, but there is a deeper motivation to his writing. Wilson appreciates Moynihan for shedding light on ghetto poverty. But by focusing on the capacity of the poor to act rationally and thoughtfully, Wilson wants us to get off the victimhood bandwagon that followed Moynihan. In his view, neither defending the victim nor blaming the victim is very helpful in moving us forward.

Moynihan was also not altogether hopeful that black family patterns—which he traced to a legacy of slavery—might change, although, to be fair, his report was not intended as a primer on poverty-alleviation strategy. Wilson's history is more recent, and his optimism is apparent: Three generations of black ghetto dwellers have been relying on welfare and sporadic work and doing so in isolation from the mainstream. It is folly to believe that some distinctive behavior, values, or outlooks have not arisen as a consequence. Whereas Moynihan seemed at pains to point out "pathology" in the black community, in Wilson's work, the recognition functions almost like confession: Let us face the truth, so that we may finally bring forth change.

The book stands to have a powerful impact in policy circles because it points to the elephant in the room. Wilson knows it is difficult to engineer cultural change. We can train black youths, we can move their families to better neighborhoods, etc., but changing their way of thinking is not so easy. Evidence of this lies in the many "mobility" programs that move inner-city families to lower-poverty suburbs: Young women continue to have children out of wedlock and, inexplicably, the young men who move out return to their communities to commit crime! These patterns flummox researchers and, according to Wilson, they will continue to remain mysterious until we look at culture for an answer.

Critics will complain that Wilson himself has little to offer in terms of policy recommendations. But More Than Just Race contains some clues as to where he may be headed. He emphasizes the advantages of "race neutral" programs. Wilson knows that Americans and their elected leaders are more likely to support initiatives that are not identified with poor blacks. And in this economy, there is no shortage of disadvantaged Americans—white or black—who require employment assistance and supportive services. He is also partial to addressing joblessness first, despite his insistence that culture matters (and that behaviors don't change as quickly as policymakers wish). Wilson repeatedly points to the benefits that jobs programs and vocational training have on the cultural front. Stated somewhat crudely, increasing employment will reduce the number of people who might promote or even condone deviant behavior. Change might not occur overnight, and it may not be wholesale, but it will take place.